Polster, Lieder, Woodruff, & Lucchesi, L.C.

12412 Powerscourt Drive

St. Louis, Missouri 63131-3615

| Telephone: (314) 238-2400 Facsimile: (314) 238-2401 |
|---|
| Date: April 8, 2005 |
| To: United States Patent & Trademark Office |
| Company: |
| Fax No.: 1-703-872-9306 |
| From: Nelson D. Noltc |
| No. of Pages, Including Cover: 6 |
| Re: LUMA 7366D1 – Response to Office Action |
| Comments: |
| THE DOCUMENTS ACCOMPANYING THIS TRANSMISSION CONTAIN INFORMATION FROM THE LAW FIRM OF POLSTER, LIEDER, WOODRUFF & LUCCIIESI, L.C. THE INFORMATION IS CONFIDENTIAL AND/OR LEGALLY PRIVILEGED. THE INFORMATION IS INTENDED ONLY FOR THE USE OF THE INDIVIDUAL OR ENTITY NAMED ON THIS TRANSMISSION SHEET. IF YOU ARE NOT THE INTENDED RECIPIENT, ANY DISCLOSURE, COPYING, DISTRIBUTION OR THIE TAKING OF ANY ACTION IN RELIANCE ON THE CONTENTS OF THIS FACSIMILE INFORMATION IS PROHIBITED. THE DOCUMENTS SHOULD BE RETURNED TO THIS FIRM IMMEDIATELY. IF YOU HAVE RECEIVED THIS FACSIMILE IN ERROR, PLEASE NOTIFY US BY TELEPHONE IMMEDIATELY SO THAT WE CAN ARRANGE FOR THE RETURN OF THE DOCUMENTS TO US AT NO COST TO YOU. CONFIRMING COPY TO BE MAILED: YES NO SO THAT WE CAN ARRANGE CONTACT THE SENDER AT (314) 238-2400 |
| |
| |

Docket No.: LUMA 7366D1

Date: April 8, 2005

| In re application of: Isidore I. Lamke, et al. | | | |
|--|-------------------------|--|--|
| Serial No.: 10/787,494 | Group No.: 2875 | | |
| Filed: February 25, 2004 | Examiner: Anabel M. Ton | | |
| For: LED LAMP ASSEMBLY | | | |

Mail Stop AMENDMENT Commissioner for Patents PO Box 1450 Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

TRANSMITTAL

| Transn | nitted herewith | 1\$: | | | |
|-------------|--|---|--|--|--|
| \boxtimes | An amendment in the above-identified application in response to the Office | | | | |
| Action | mailed March | 29, 2005; | | | |
| \boxtimes | No fee is requ | ired. | | | |
| Small i | Entity Status: | | | | |
| | | ant claims small entity status. | | | |
| | Applie | ant DOES NOT claim small entity status. | | | |
| | | | | | |

The fee has been calculated as shown:

| | Claims Remaining After Amendment | Highest No. Previously Paid For | Present Extra | Rate – Other Than A Small Entity | Rate Small Entity | Additional Fee |
|------------------|----------------------------------|---------------------------------------|------------------|--|----------------------|-------------------|
| Total Claims | 24 - | 24 | 0 | \$50.00 | \$25.00 | \$0.00 |
| Indep. Claims | 4 - | 4 | 0 | \$200.00 | \$100.00 | \$0.00 |
| | | Total A | Additional | Fee: | | \$0.00 |

No fee is due.

The Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge any additional fees or credit overpayment under 37 CFR 1.16 and 1.17 which may be required by this paper to Deposit Account 162201. Duplicate copies of this sheet are enclosed.

Registration No: 42,938

I hereby certify that this correspondence is being facsimile transmitted to the U.S. Patent and Trademark Office Fax No. 703-872-9306 on April 8, 2005.

APR 0 3 2016

PATENT IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

| APPLICANT: | Isidore 1. Lamke et al. | I hereby certify that this correspondence is being facsimile transmitted to the |
|--------------|-------------------------|---|
| SERIAL NO.: | 10/787,494 | U.S. Patent and Trademark Office Fax No. 703-872-9306 on April 8, 2005. |
| FILED: | February 25, 2004 | 10, 173-472-5300 011 2411 0, 23132 |
| EXAMINER: | Anabel M. Ton | MINSO |
| DOCKET NO.: | LUMA 7366D1 | Nelson D. Nolte, Reg. No. 42,938 |
| ART UNIT: | 2875 | |
| FOR: LED LAN | MP ASSEMBLY | |
| | | |

Commissioner for Patents P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

RESPONSE TO OFFICE ACTION

Honorable Commissioner:

In response to the Office Action mailed March 29, 2005, it is respectfully requested that the Commissioner reconsider the rejections made in view of the following amendments and remarks.

REMARKS

The Examiner has rejected claims 18-23 of the present application under the judicially created doctrine of obviousness-type double patenting in view of claims 9-15 of U.S. Patent No. 6,739,733. Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection in that 35 U.S.C. § 121 prevents the Examiner from restricting a claim from an application and then subsequently holding that the same claim is an obvious variation of the claims of the application from which it was restricted.